DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 169 978 JC 790 273

AUTHOR Lehmann, Guenter; Lucas, John A.
TITLE Follow-up Survey of Former Architecture Transfer Students. Volume IX, No. 13.
INSTITUTION William Rainey Harper Coll., Palatine, Ill.
PUB DATE 10 Apr 78
NOTE 52p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Architectural Education; Career Choice; Community Colleges; Employment Patterns; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; Institutional Research; Job Analysis; *Junior Colleges; *Participant Satisfaction; *Persistence; Relevance (Education); Transfer Policy; *Transfer Programs; Universities

ABSTRACT

Surveys were mailed to the 257 students who had enrolled in the first of the core courses in the architecture transfer program (ARC) at Harper College between 1969 and 1978. Of the target population, 18% had stopped at this point; 22% had enrolled in two ARC courses; 20% had enrolled in three ARC courses; 21% had met minimum requirements by taking both ARC core courses and a math course; and 19% had met all requirements by taking four ARC courses and a math course. Of respondents, 72% were in the transfer architecture design program; 25% had achieved a bachelor's degree; and all averaged over a 3.0 grade point average at their transfer institution, as compared to an average of 2.64 at Harper. The study found that 93% of all attempts to transfer courses were successful. In addition, the number of courses a student took was found to be related to grade point average and to whether the student remained with immediate goals in the field or in college--the group meeting full requirements had a significantly higher grade point average and a higher rate of persistence in the field. Among the employed respondents, drafting and designing were the most commonly used responsibilities. Cost estimating was followed by writing specifications and interior design in ranking by use. Student evaluations rated ARC courses between "somewhat beneficial" and "very beneficial." Survey results are detailed, and the survey instrument is appended. (Author/MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED169974

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF FORMER ARCHITECTURE TRANSFER STUDENTS

Guenter Lehmann
Assistant Professor, Architecture

John A. Lucas, Director
Office of Planning and Research

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Lucas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 273

WILLIAM RAINEY HARPER COLLEGE
Volume IX, No. 13
April 10, 1978

ABSTRACT

THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY WAS TO FOLLOW FORMER STUDENTS AND TO PARTIALLY EVALUATE THE ARCHITECTURAL TRANSFER PROGRAM. A TOTAL OF 257 STUDENTS WHO HAD TAKEN ARC 101 SINCE 1969 WERE IDENTIFIED AND WERE DIVIDED INTO FIVE GROUPS DEPENDING ON THE NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL COURSES TAKEN. THIS POPULATION WAS SENT A MAIL SURVEY AND AFTER THREE WEEKS THE NON-RESPONDENTS WERE TELEPHONED. AFTER THE FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURE, A 46 PERCENT RESPONSE RATE WAS ACHIEVED WHICH WAS NOT WHAT WAS HOPED FOR, BUT ALL THAT WAS POSSIBLE GIVEN THE TIGHT TIME FRAME REQUIRED. BESIDES THE SURVEY, ADDITIONAL DATA SUCH AS COURSES TAKEN AND GPA AT HARPER WERE GATHERED ON EACH MEMBER OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY SHOW THAT 40 PERCENT OF THIS ORIGINAL TARGET POPULATION EVENTUALLY MEETS THE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS OF ARC 101 and 102 AND EITHER MATH 105 AND 201. STUDENTS WHO DID TAKE MORE ARCHITECTURE COURSES AT HARPER WERE MORE APT TO RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY, HAD A HIGHER GPA AT HARPER AND WERE MORE APT TO INITIALLY CLASSIFY THEMSELVES AS AN ARCHITECTURE TRANSFER STUDENT.

CONSIDERING THOSE STUDENTS WHO HAD COMPLETED TWO CORE COURSES OR MORE, 58 TO 77 PERCENT OF THEM TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER INSTITUTION AND 16 TO 38 PERCENT HAVE ACHIEVED A BACHELORS DEGREE TO DATE. STUDENTS WHO TOOK MORE ARCHITECTURE COURSES AT HARPER ARE MORE APT TO MAJOR IN ARCHITECTURE AT THEIR NEW INSTITUTION. SOME 81 PERCENT OF FULLY QUALIFIED ARCHITECTURE STUDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED ARE NOW IN ARCHITECTURE PROGRAMS. THE STUDENTS ARE PERFORMING WELL AS THEY ARE AVERAGING OVER A 3.00 GRADEPOINT AVERAGE DESPITE THE FACT THEY AVERAGED ONLY 2.64 AT HARPER. THE TRANSFER STUDENTS WERE SUCCESSFUL IN TRANSFERRRING 93 PERCENT OF THEIR COURSES.

CONSIDERING ONLY STUDENTS WHO HAVE TAKEN THREE OR MORE ARCHITECTURE COURSES AT HARPER, 66 TO 76 PERCENT HAVE REMAINED IN ARCHITECTURE OR A RELATED FIELD EITHER ON THE JOB OR IN A COLLEGE PROGRAM. RESPONSIBILITIES MORE FREQUENTLY UNDERTAKEN WERE DESIGNING AND DRAFTING.

THE COURSES TAKEN AT HARPER WERE RATED A LITTLE LOWER THAN OTHER STUDIES HAVE SHOWN FORMER STUDENTS RATING COURSES IN THEIR MAJOR FIELD.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Purpose 1

II. Population Surveyed 1

III. Method 2

IV. Discussion of Results 3

V. Major Conclusions 4

VI. Detailed Results

A. Distribution of Architecture Course Achievement at Harper by all 6

B. Architectural Transfer Program - Program Followed 7

C. Architectural Transfer Program Educational Achievements 7

D. Relationship of Present Field of Transfer Students to the Field of Architecutre 7

E. Colleges Attended by all Transfer Students 8

F. List of Major Areas of Study and Colleges at Which Transfer Stduents Received Degrees 8

G. Major Area of Study for All Transfer Students 10

1. Group I
2. Group II
3. Group III
4. Group IV
5. Group V

H. Grade Point Average of Students Who Transfer GPA at New College vs. GPA at Harper 11

I. Success Rate for Transferring Architectural Course Credit From Harper College 12

J. Architectural Courses and Colleges Where Architectural Courses Would Not Transfer 13

K. Degree to Which Former Architecture Students at Harper Have Remained in the Field 14

L. Geographic Distribution of Former Architecture Students Who Are Now Employed 14

M. Primary Responsibilities of Former Students Working in Architecture or Related Fields 15

1. All Groups
2. Group I
3. Group II
4. Group III
5. Group IV
6. Group V

N. Evaluation of Courses Taken by Architectural Students at Harper.....21

O. Employers of Former Students Who Are Now Employed.....22

P. Descriptions of Jobs Unrelated to Architecture.....24

Q. Courses Which, If Included in the Curriculum, Would Have Benefited Students.....25

R. Strengths of Harper's Architecture Transfer Program.....26

S. Other Suggestions for Improving Harper's Transfer Program.....28

VIII. Appendix 30

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to follow former students who were enrolled in Architectural Transfer (ARC) courses. This follow-up study is to help evaluate the Architectural Transfer Program and to provide data to help in the future planning of this program. Bob Cormack, Dean of Careers and Academic Planning, along with Urban Thobe, the Associate Dean of the Fine Arts and Design Division requested the study. Guenter Lehmann, the lead teacher in the Architecture Transfer Program, helped in the design of the study and in the location of former students.

The study was not designed to evaluate the cost effectiveness of the program or to evaluate the enrollment in the program. This will have to be done in other parts of the total evaluation. Rather the purpose of the study was to evaluate the Transfer Architecture Program through the eyes of those former students who did enroll in various courses in the program.

Population Surveyed

A total of 257 students were identified who have taken ARC 101 since 1969. These 257 were subdivided into five groups according to the total number of Architecture courses taken while at Harper. Group I took only ARC 101 and Group II took ARC 101 and one other core course. Group III former students enrolled in at least three architecture core courses but failed to meet the minimum requirements. Group IV met the minimum requirements by taking at least ARC 101, 102 and either Math 105 or Math 201. Finally, Group V met the full requirements by enrolling in ARC 101, 102, 205, 206 and either Math 105 or Math 201. After the follow-up effort the following survey return rates were achieved within each of the sub groups identified.

Table I

	Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Total
Population Surveyed	47	57	50	55	48	257
Mail Responses	2	8	11	11	16	48
Telephone	9	15	15	15	15	69
Total Responses	11	23	26	26	31	117
Response Rate	23.4	40.4	52.0	47.3	64.6	45.5

The return rate for the group taking only ARC 101 was very low but the return rate imporved for students who were more involved in the program. A 65 percent return rate for group V was not too bad. Although it would have been preferable to obtain higher return rates near 70 percent, this was not possible considering the tight time constraints for the project.

Method

The survey instrument, shown in the appendix, was developed by the Office of Planning and Research and Gunter Lehman, the lead teacher of the Architecture Transfer Program, with approval by the Associate Dean, Urban Thobe of the Fine Arts and Design Division. This survey was mailed to the target population identified and after three weeks the non-respondents were telephoned.

Student records were examined for all members of the target population and data on courses enrolled in at Harper and grade point average at Harper were collected. Results of the survey were analyzed separately for each sub-group identified in the survey population.

Discussion of Results

In examining the 257 students who enrolled in ARC 101, only 18 percent (Group I) stopped at this point failing to take any additional Architectural core courses. Some 22 percent (Group II) took two Architecture core courses and in addition 20 percent (Group III) enrolled in at least three core coureses but failed to meet minimum requirements. Thus 40 percent (Group IV and V) of the students ever taking ARC 101 eventually meet the minimum requirements of completing ARC 101 and 102 and either Math 105 or Math 201.

These five groups differed in a number of other ways in addition to their survey response rate and the courses they enrolled in at Harper. The gradepoint of the five groups differed considerably with the first group below a 2.00 average. On the other hand the groups meeting the minimum requirements maintained a 2.70 average with only 21 percent of its members below a 2.00 average. In examining the students initial goals at Harper, only 18 percent of Group I intended to enter the Architectural Transfer Program wile 97 percent of the group meeting all requirements intended to enter the Architectural Transfer Program. This percentage of students intending to enter the Architectural Transfer Program was directly related to the number of Architectural core courses taken.

Obviously, one of the immediate goals of any transfer program is to successfully transfer students to a college or university. In this regard, among those former Architecture students who had completed two or more core courses, 58 percent to 77 percent have transferred so far. Moreover, 16 to 38 percent have completed at least a bacehlor's degree. Considering those students who have transferred, over half (54%) are presently enrolled in Architecture fields while only 17 percent are enrolled in unrelated fields. The more Architecture courses a student took at Harper, the more apt that student is to be enrolled in Architecutre at the new college. For example, among students who completed all the core requirements, 81 percent are enrolled in Architecture and only nine percent are enrolled in unrelated fields. Also, in this regard, the more Architecture courses a student took at Harper the more apt that student is to be enrolled at University of Illinois Circle campus. Students from Harper who transfer from the Architectural Program earn over a 3.00 average at their new college and this is the same for all groups. These same students, who reported a GPA at their new college only averaged 2.64 at Harper. The entire survey population only averaged 2.19 at Harper. This would Indicate the Architecture Transfer Porgram grades hard but prepares their students well for transferring.

In exploring the difficulty in transferring Architectural core courses, this study found that out of 361 attempts to transfer these courses, 93 percent were successful. ARC 201 and 202 were the hardest courses to transfer as only 73-77 percent of these courses transferred successfully. This percentage of success may be a little overstated as some students indicated they had problems transferring courses but because it was so long ago, they couldn't remember how many or what specific courses didn't transfer. In the detailed results section, there is a list of colleges and the courses which wouldn't transfer.

Another factor which is relevant to evaluating the Architectural Transfer Program is the nubmer of former students who remain in the field either on the job or in college. Over the entire target population 31 percent remain specifically in Architecture while 65 percent are in Architecture or related fields. When we consider only students who enrolled in three or more Architectural core courses, 65 to 76 percent stay in Architecture or related fields. If we only consider students who met the full Architecture requirements while at Harper, we find 57 percent remain specifically in the field of Architecture. In addition to these figures, there is about five percent of the population who plan or hope to return to the Architecture field soon.

Looking at migration we find of those employed, 69 percent have positions in the Chicago metropolitan area. Also of those employeed, drafting and designing are by far the most common responsibilities used. A distant third is cost estimating followed by spec writing and interior design. A complete listing of job responsibilities is found in the detailed restults section.

These former students also were asked to evaluate the courses they enrolled in at Harper. In general, the ARC courses were rated between somewhat beneficial and very beneficial. There were 12 courses rated better than the highest rated ARC course. Students who had taken more Architecture courses at Harper rate these courses higher than students who had only taken one or two Architecture courses. Only a limited number of this target population enrolled in the Compter ATE courses. The ATE 105 course was rated as only a little better than somewhat beneficial while a limited number of students rated ATE 206 and 207 poorly. In general, other studies show that former students usually rate courses in their major field higher than was shown in this study.

Major Conculsions

The study divided all students who had ever taken ARC 101 into five groups according to their enrollment in other Architecture Transfer core subjects. This analysis shows 40 percent of this original target population eventually meets the minimum requirements of ARC 101 and 102 and either Math 105 or 201. Students who did take more Architecture courses at Harper were more apt to respond to this survey, had a higher GPA at Harper and were more apt to initially classify themselves as an Architecture Transfer student.

Considering those students who had completed two core courses or more, 58 to 77 percent of them transferred to another institution and 16 to 38 percent have achieved a bachelors degree to date. Students who took more Architecture courses at Harper are more apt to major in Architecture at thier new institution. Some 81 percent of fully qualified Architecture students who transferred are now in Architecture programs. The students are performing well as they are averaging over a 3.00 gradepoint average despite the fact they averaged only 2.64 at Harper. The transfer students were successful in transferring 93 percent of their courses.

Considering only students who have taken three or more Architecture courses at Harper, 66 to 76 percent have remained in Architecture or a related field either on the job or in a college program. Responsibilities most frequently undertaken were designing and drafting.

The courses taken at Harper were rated a little lower than other studies have shown former students rating courses in their major field.

DETAILED RESULTS

Distribution of Architecture Course Achievement at Haprer
by All Students Enrolling in ARC 101

	Number	Percent
Took ARC 101 only	47	18.3
Took ARC 101 and one other core course	57	22.2
Took at least three core courses but didn't meet minimum requirements	50	19.4
Met minimum requirements by taking at least ARC 101 and ARC 102 and either Math 105 or Math 201	55	21.4
Met all requirements by taking ARC 101, 102, 205, 206 and either Math 105 or Math 201	48	18.7
Total	257	100.0

Architectural Transfer Program

Total number of population	47		57		50		55		48		257	
	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Group V		Total	
Program Followed	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Transfer Architecture Design	2	18.2	10	41.7	18	72	25	92.6	30	96.8	85	72.0
Occupational ATE Program Associate Degree	4	36.4	5	20.9	4	16	-	-	-	-	13	11.0
Occupational ATE Program Certificate	-	-	2	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1.7
General interest only	5	45.4	5	20.8	2	8	1	3.7	1	3.2	14	11.9
Other	-	-	2	8.3	1	4	1	3.7	-	-	-	-
	11	100.0	24	100.0	25	100	27	100.0	31	100.0	118	100.0
Education Achievements												
Taken no other courses since leaving Harper	6	54.5	8	36.4	6	24	6	23.1	13	41.9	39	33.9
Less than 36 hours at new college	-	-	2	9.1	9	36	4	15.4	6	19.4	21	18.3
36-54 hours at new college	-	-	5	22.7	1	4	2	7.7	5	16.1	13	11.3
More than 54 hours but no degree at new college	1	9.1	1	4.5	3	12	4	15.4	2	6.5	11	9.6
Bachelor's degree	4	36.4	6	27.3	4	16	10	38.4	5	16.1	29	25.2
Master's degree	-	-	-	-	2	8		-	-	-	2	1.7
	11	100.0	22	100.0	35	100	26	100.0	31	100.0	115	100.0

Relationship of Present Major Field of Transfer Students to the Field of Architecture

Those with Degrees												
Identical	1		-		5		1		3		10	
Related	1		-		1		2		0		4	
Non-related	1		7		3		2		2		15	
Total transfers												
Identical	2	40	6	40	9	50	8	44	17	81	42	54
Related	1	20	5	33	6	33	8	45	2	10	22	29
Non-related	2	40	4	27	3	17	2	11	2	9	13	17
	5	100	15	100	18	100	18	100	21	100	77	100

Colleges Attended by Transfer Students

Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
University of Oregon	University of Illinois Circle - 2	University of Illinois Circle - 4	University of Illinois Circle - 8	University of Illinois Circle - 7
Purdue	Illinois Institute of Technology	Northern Illinois - 2	University of Illinois Champaign - 2	Illinois Institute of Technology - 2
Western Illinois	University of Wisconsin	Illinois Institute of Technology - 2	Northern Illinois	Northern Illinois
Southern Illinois	Temple	University of Wisconsin	American Academy of Art - Chicago	University of Wisconsin
Univesity of Colorado	Columbia Art School	University of Illinois Champaign	Western Illinois	Georgia Tech
	University of Miami	University of Georgia	Southern Illinois	Iowa State
	University of New Mexico	University of Kentucky	University of Iowa	Western Illinois
	Northeastern Illinois	University of Arkansas	Bradley University	Arizona State
	Washburn Business School	Western Illinois	University of Miami	University of Arizona
	Ferris State (Mich)	John Brown (Ark.)	Eastern Kentucky	
	Thornton	Mundelien College		
	Morrison Institute of Technology			

List of Major Areas of Study and Colleges at Which Transfer Students Received Degrees

Group I

Degree	Major Area	Colleges
B.A.	Architecture	University of Oregon
B.A.	Political Science	Western Illinois
B.S.	Applied Math	University of Colorado

Group II

Degree	Major Area	Colleges
B.A.	Unstated - 3	Northeastern Illinois
		Univeristy of Miami
		University of N. Mexico
B.S.	Unstated	St. Thomas-St. Paul
B.S.	Biology	Northern Illinois
B.A.	Auto Body	Ferris State, Michigan
M.Ed.	Counseling Psychology	Arizona State

List of Major Areas of Study and Colleges at Which Transfer Students Received Degrees (cont.)

Group III

Degree	Major Area	Colleges
B.A.	Architecture - 2	Western Illinois
B.A.	Landscape Architecture	Univesity of Georgia
		Florida State
B.A.	Education	Ill. Inst. of Tech.
B.A.	Fine Arts	Southern Illinois
B.A.	Comp. Planning & Design	University of Illinois Champaign
M.A.	Education	Northern Illinois
M.A.	Architecture & M.B.A.	University of Illinois Champiagn
B.A.	Psychology-Sociology	Northern Illinois

Group IV

Degree	Major Area	Colleges
B.S.	Education	University of Illinois Circle Campus - 4
B.S.	Industrial Arts	University of Illinois Champaign - 2
B.A.	Architectural Design	Northern Illinois
B.S.E.	Structural Engineering	Univeristy of Iowa
B.S.	Psychology	Eastern Kentucky
B.A.	Architecture	

Group V

Degree	Major Area	Colleges
B.S.	Unstated - 2	University of Illinois - Circle - 2
B.A.	Architecture - 2	Georgia Tech
B.A.	Land Architecture	University of Illinois - Champaign
		Iowa State

-6-

Major Area of Study for all Transfer Students

Group I

Architecture
Landscape Architecture
Political Science
Airport Management
Applied Math

Group II

Architecture - 4
Psychology
Counseling Psychology
Sculpture/Photography
Architecture Engineering
Design
Graphic Arts
Biology
Auto Body
Engineering
Graphic Design
Civil Engineering

Group III

Architecture - 4
Architectural Design - 2
Electronics
Construction Technology
Landscape Architecture
General Business Adm. -
Interior Design
Education
Interior Design
Engineering
Environmental Science
Fine Art
Bible
Land Planning
Architecture & Business

Group IV

Architecture - 5
Architecture Design - 2
Math - ?
Industry and Technology
Architecture Drawing
Commerical Art
Math
Structural Engineering
Psychology
Political Science
Civil Engineering
Interior Design
Graphic Design

Group V

Architecture - 9
Architectural Design - 6
Landscape Architecture - 2
General Courses
Board of Governors
Georgraphy and Urban Planning
Computer

Grade Point Average of Students Who Transferred GPA at New College vs. GPa at Harper

Cumulative Grade Point Average at New College	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Group V		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4.0	1	25	1	8.3	3	16.7	-	-	1	5	4	5.3
3.8	-	-	2	16.7	1	5.6	1	4.5	2	10	6	8.0
3.6	-	-	-	-	2	11.1	2	9.1	4	20	9	12.0
3.4	-	-	1	8.3	2	11.1	2	9.1	1	5	6	8.0
3.2	1	25	1	8.3	-	-	5	22.8	-	-	7	9.3
3.0	2	50	4	33.4	2	11.1	3	13.6	3	15	14	18.7
2.8	-	-	-	-	3	16.7	5	22.7	2	10	10	13.4
2.6	-	-	-	-	2	11.1	2	9.1	4	20	8	10.7
2.4	-	-	2	16.7	1	5.6	2	9.1	-	-	5	6.7
2.2	-	-	-		1	5.6	-	-	-	-	1	1.3
2.0	-	-	1	8.3	1	5.6	-	-	1	5	3	4.0
1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	1	1.3
1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	5	1	1.3
1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less than 1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	4	100	12	100.0	18	100.0	22	100.0	20	100.0	75	100.0
Cumulative GPA at new college	3.30		3.08		3.11		3.04		2.97		3.04	
Cumulative GPA while at Harper	3.16		2.40		2.61		2.70		2.68		2.64	
Cumulative GPA of total target population wile at Harper	1.71		2.05		2.33		2.45		2.44		2.19	
	N=46		N=57		N=48		N=56		N=39		N=246	

Success Rate for Transferring Architectural Course Credit from Harper College

Courses Transferred	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Group V		Total	
ARC 205	T	S%	T	%S	T	%S	T	%S	T	%S	T	%S
ARC 205	1	100	1	100	12	100	4	100	15	100	33	100
MTH 201	-	-	2	100	2	100	12	100	10	100	26	100
PHY 121	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	100	7	100	11	100
PHY 122	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	100	6	100	10	100
EGR 150	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	50	3	100	5	100
MTH 105	1	100	2	100	3	100	14/13	93	15	100	35/34	97.1
ATE 105	1	100	3	100	5	100	10/9	90	7	100	27/26	96.3
ARC 206	1	100	-	-	9/8	100	5/4	80	16	100	31/29	93.6
ART 110	-	-	2	100	5	100	10/9	90	14/13	93	31/29	93
ART 111	-	-	2	100	4	100	5/4	80	13/21	92	24/22	91.7
ARC 102	-	-	1	100	9	100	17/14	83	17/16	94	44/40	90.9
ARC 101	2	100	7/6	85.7	16/14	86.7	18/15	84	17/16	94	60/53	88.3
ARC 201	-	-	1	100	1	100	4/3	75	7/5	72	13/10	76.9
ARC 202	-	-	-	-	2	100	3	100	6/3	50	11/8	72.7
	6/6	100	21/20	95.2	69/66	95.7	112/100	89.3	153/144	94.1	361/336	93.1

T=Number who tried transfer/
number transferred successfully

S=percent successful of
those who tried

Note: Five additional students reported having trouble transferring courses from Harper but couldn't remember specifically which couses didin't transfer

Architecture Courses and Colleges Where Architecture Courses Would Not Transfer

Courses

Washburn Business School	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
Northeastern Illinois University	ARC 201 - Design I
University of Illinois	ARC 206 - Architectural History II
University of Arkansas	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
Northern Illinois University	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
University of Illinois - Circle	ARC 201 - Design I
Southern Illinois	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
University of Illinois - Champaign	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
	ARC 102 - Basic Design II
	ATE 105 - Computer Math for Arch. Tech.
	ART 110 - Drawing I
	ART 111 - Drawing II
University of Iowa	ARC 102 - Basic Design II
University of Illinois	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
	ARC 102 - Basic Design II
University of Illinois	ARC 206 - Architectural History II
Thornton Community College	ATE 105 - Computer Math of Arch Tech.
	ART 110 - Drawing I
	ART 111 - Drawing II
University of Illinois - Champaign	ARC 101 - Basic Design I
	ARC 102 - Basic Design II
	ARC 201 - Design I
	ARC 202 - Design II
	ART 110 - Drawing I
	ART 111 - Drawing II
Georgia Tech	ARC 201 - Design I
	ARC 202 - Design II
Iowa State University	ARC 202 - Design II

Courses not transferred but college not cited

ARC 101 - 7
ARC 201 - 4
ARC 102 - 4
ART 110 - 3
ART 111 - 3
ARC 202 - 3
ARC 206 - 2
ATE 105 - 2

Degree to Which Former Architecture Students at Harper Have Remained in the Field

Employed in Architecture office	Group I N	Group I %	Group II N	Group II %	Group III N	Group III %	Group IV N	Group IV %	Group V N	Group V %	Total N	Total %
Employed in Architecture office	0	0	3	12.5	4	14.8	5	17.2	2	6.7	14	11.6
Enrolled in Architectural Program	1	9.1	1	4.2	3	11.1	4	13.8	15	50.0	24	19.8
Sub-Total in Architecture	1	9.1	4	16.7	7	25.9	9	31.0	17	56.7	38	31.4
Employed in Architecture related area	3	27.3	7	29.1	9	33.4	6	20.7	5	16.7	30	24.8
Enrolled in Architectural related area	0	0	1	4.2	4	14.8	4	13.8	1	3.3	10	8.3
Sub-total in Architectural related area	3	27.3	8	33.3	13	48.2	10	34.5	6	20.0	40	33.1
Sub-Total in Architecture or related areas	4	36.4	12	50.0	20	74.1	19	65.5	23	76.7	78	64.5
Seeking employement in related area	0	0	0	0	1	3.7	2	6.9	2	6.7	5	4.1
Plan to enroll in related field	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.3	1	.8
Sub-total seeking to re-enter related field	0	0	0	0	1	3.7	2	6.9	3	10.0	6	4.9
Sub-total in related field or seeking to enter related field	4	36.4	12	50.0	21	77.8	21	72.4	26	86.7	84	69.4
Employed in unrelated field	7	63.6	9	37.5	6	22.2	6	20.7	4	13.3	32	26.4
Enrolled in unrelated field	0	0	2	8.3	0	0	2	6.9	0	0	4	3.3
Seeking employment in unrelated field	0	0	1	4.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.8
Sub-total in unrelated fields	7	63.6	12	50.0	6	22.2	8	27.6	4	13.3	37	30.6
Total	11	100.0	24	100.0	27	100.0	29	100.0	30	100.0	121	100.0

Geographic Distribution of Former Architecture Students Who Are Now Employed

Work Area	Group I N	Group I %	Group II N	Group II %	Group III N	Group III %	Group IV N	Group IV %	Group V N	Group V %	Total N	Total %
Downtown Chicago	1	11.2	2	10.5	3	12.6	5	25.0	1	4.5	12	12.8
Metro Area	4	44.4	12	63.2	14	58.3	11	55.0	12	54.5	53	56.4
Other state of Illinois	2	22.2	2	10.5	5	20.8	2	10.0	5	22.7	16	17.0
Out of state	2	22.2	3	15.8	2	8.3	2	10.0	4	18.3	13	13.8
	9	100.0	19	100.0	24	100.0	20	100.0	22	100.0	94	100.0

Primary Responsibilities of Former Stduents
Working in Architecture or Related Fields

All Groups

Responsibility	Number
Drafting	32
Designing	30
Estimating	17
Spec Writing	14
Interior Design	14
Electrical work	11
Building inspector	10
Surveying	8
Purchase of building products	8
Computer applications	7
Contracting	7
Carpentry	7
HVAC work	6
Manufacture of building products	5
Urban and regional planning	3
Masonry work	2
Architectural photography	1
Architectural storage	1
Sales and commercial display exhibit	1
Cartography	1
Working drawings	1

Job Responsibilities - Group I

2 respondents	Architecture		Engineering		Municipality or Government		Corporation		Total	
Responsibilities	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T
Drafting	2	100					1	50	1	50
Designing	2	100					1	50	1	50
Interior Design	2	100					1	50	1	50
Computer Applications	1	50					1	50		
Surveying	1	50					1	50		
Cartography	1	50					1	50		
Graphics	1	50					1	50		
Contracting										
Carpentry										
Masonry work										
Manufacturer or building products										
Purchaser of building products										
Electrical work										
HVAC work										
Building inspector										

Job Responsibilities - Group II

8 respondents	Architecture		Engineering		Municipality or Government		Corporation		Total	
Responsibilities	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T
Designing	2	25	2	25	3	37.5			8	87
Drafting	2	25	2	25			2	25	6	75
Estimating	2	25	1	12.5			3	37.5	6	75
Contracting	2	25	1	12.5			3	37.5	6	75
Electrical work	1	12.5	2	25			3	37.5	6	75
Spec. writing	1	12.5	1	12.5			3	37.5	5	62
Manufacturer of building products	1	12.5	2	25			1	12.5	4	50
Building inspector	1	12.5	1	12.5			2	25.0	4	50
Surveying	2	25					1	25.0	3	37
Purchaser of building products	1	12.5	1	12.5			1	12.5	3	37
Computer applications	1	12.5	1	12.5					2	25
HVAC work			1	12.5			1	12.5	2	25
Interior Design	1	12.5					1	12.5	2	25
Carptentry							1	12.5	1	12
Masonry work							1	12.5	1	12
Architectural photography			1	12.5					1	12
Architectural storage			1	12.5					1	12
Urban and regional planning							1	12.5	1	12
Sales and commercial display exhibit							1	12.5	1	12
Catogrphay							1	12.5	1	12
Working drawings			1	12.5						

Job Responsibilities - Group III

12 respondents	Architecture		Engineering		Municipality or Government		Corporation		Total	
Responsibilities	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T
Drafting	4	33.3	4	33.3			2	16.7	10	83
Designing	3	25.0	2	16.7			3	25.0	8	80
Spec. writing	2	16.7	1	8.3			2	16.7	5	41
Interior design	4	33.3							4	40
Purchaserer of building products	2	16.7					1	8.3	3	33
Building inspector	2	6.7							2	16
Urban and regional planner			1	8.3					2	16
Land planning			1	8.3			1	8.3	2	16
Surveying	1	8.3							1	8
Contracting	1	8.3							1	8
Carpentry	1	8.3							1	8
Manufacturer of building products	1	8.3							1	8
Sales and commerical display exhibit	1	8.3							1	8
Computer application	1	8.3							1	8
Masonry work										

Job Responsibilities - Group IV

12 respondents	Architecutre		Engineering		Municiplaity or Covernment		Corporation		Total	
Responsibilities	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T
Drafting	5	41.7	2	16.7			2	16.7	9	75
Designing	4	33.3	1	8.3			3	16.7	8	58
Estimating	1	8.3	2	16.7			1	8.3	4	33
Interior design	2	16.7					2	16.7	4	33
Computer applications	1	8.3	1	8.3					2	16
Carpentry	2	16.7							2	16
Purchaser of building products	1	8.3					1	8.3	2	16
Electrical work			1	8.3			1	8.3	2	16
HVAC work			1	8.3			1	8.3	2	16
Surveying			1	8.3					1	8
Masonry work			1	8.3					1	8
Building inspector							1	8.3	1	8
Working drawings	1	8.3							1	8
Contracting										
Manufacturer of building products										

Job Responsibilities - Group V

8 respondents	Architecture		Engineering		Municipality or Government		Corporation		Total	
Responsibilities	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T	No.	% of T
Drafting	2	25.0	1	12.5			2	25.0	5	62.0
Designing	2	25.0	1	12.5			1	12.5	4	50.0
Carpentry	1	12.5					2	25.0	3	37.5
Building inspector	1	12.5	1	12.5			1	12.5	3	37.5
Surveying	1	12.5	1	12.5					2	25.0
Electrical work	1	12.5	1	12.5					2	25.0
HVAC work	1	12.5	1	12.5					2	25.0
Interior design	1	12.5					1	12.5	2	25.0
City Planning			1	12.5					1	12.5
Masonry work										
Manufacturer of building products										
Purchaserer of building products										
Contracting										

Evaluation of Courses Taken by Architectural Students at Harper

*Benefit rating: 2=very beneficial, 1=of some benefit; 0=of little benefit

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Group IV		Group V		Total	
	N	*BR	N	*BR	N	*BR	N	*BR	N	*BR	N	*BR
ATE 201	1	2.0					1	2.0			2	2.00
ATE 202	1	2.0					1	2.0			2	2.00
ATE 203	1	2.0					1	2.0			2	2.00
ATE 204	1	2.0					1	2.0			2	2.00
History of Art									1	2.0	1	2.00
Fashion Design program									1	2.0	1	2.00
Calculus II							1	2.0			1	2.00
EGR 150			1	2.0			2	1.5	5	2.0	8	1.88
ATE 103	2	1.5	1	2.0			2	2.0			5	1.80
ATE 102	2	1.5	1	2.0			2	2.0			5	1.80
ATE 207	1	1.0					1	2.0	1	2.0	3	1.67
PHY 122							3	2.0	5	1.2	8	1.50
ATE 208	1	1.0					1	2.0			2	1.50
ARC 102			5	1.2	8	1.5	11	1.7	16	1.4	40	1.48
Solar Energy Seminar			2	1.0	1	1.0	2	1.9	4	1.6	9	1.47
ARC 201			3	1.0	4	1.25	4	1.6	10	1.6	21	1.45
ART 110	1	0	4	1.5	6	1.0	9	1.7	15	1.5	35	1.43
ART 111			2	1.0	5	1.25	6	1.5	17	1.5	30	1.43
ARC 204	2	1.0	2	1.5	4	1.5	1	2.0	2	1.0	11	1.36
ARC 203	1	1.0	2	1.5	5	1.25	2	2.0	2	1.0	12	1.35
ARC 202			3	1.0	4	1.25	4	1.6	9	1.4	20	1.35
MTH 201			1	2.0			8	2.0	14	1.2	20	1.34
ARC 101	1	0	8	.75	10	1.5	11	1.7	15	1.3	45	1.32
ARC 206	1	1.0	1	0	8	1.22	4	1.3	15	1.4	29	1.27
ATE 105	2	1.0	2	1.0			6	1.7	6	1.0	16	1.26
ARC 205	1	1.0	3	0	10	1.20	3	2.0	15	1.3	32	1.20
ATE 104	2	1.0	1	2.0			3	1.3	2	.8	8	1.19
ATE 209									1	1.0	1	1.00
PHY 121							6	1.3	9	.8	15	1.00
SOC 205									1	1.0	1	1.00
ATE 205	1	1.0	1	1.0			2	.5			4	.75
ATE 206	1	1.0	1	1.0			2	.5			4	.75
ATE 101	2	1.0	6	.33			1	2.0	2	1.0	11	.73
SOC 101									3	.33	3	.33
Anthropology									1	0	1	0
ENG 101									1	0	1	0
ENG 102									1	0	1	0

List of Employers

Group I

Kemper Insurance - Long Grove - 2
Lane County Planning Dept. - 125 E. 8th. Ave. - Eugene, Ore.
Homemakers - Woodfield
Lakeland Construction - Des Plaines
Continental Electric - Skokie
Bank and Trust - Arlington Heights
Armanetti Liquors - Crystal Lake
Computer Sharing Service - Denver, Col.

Group II

Baxter Travenol Labs
M-M Electric Co. - Skokie
McHenry County Youth Service Bureau - Woodstock
Sam Christianson - Farmington, N.M.
Wilson Sporting Goods - River Grove
Allstate Insurance - Wheeling
Joy Builders - Palatine
Victoria Station - Schaumburg
G & R Masonry - Wheeling
Sargent & Lundy Engineers - Chicago
Checkmate Builders - Long Grove
Graphics Group
Consoer Townsend & Assoc. - Hoffman Group, Inc.

Group III

Self employed - 2
Honeywell Inc. - Arlington Heights
Lambert Environmental - 4417 Belmont Ave. - Dallas, Texas
Keifer & Assoc. - Chicago
Spot Nails - Rolling Meadows
Omnuon Limited - Des Plaines
Extel Corp. - Northbrook
Maine South High School - Park Ridge
Busch & Markson - Park Ridge
Scott Lad & Foods - 1 Scott Lad Lane, Lansing, Mich.
Coca Cola Bttling Co. - Niles
Wayne Deeke - Bartlett
Northern Illinois University - DeKalb
Golden's Enterprises - Roselle
Skidmore Owings & Morrow - Chicago
Green Garden Assoc. - Chicago
Sears - Woodfield
R D & C Field Carpentry - Addison
Harvest Arnot Co. - Northbrook

List of Employers

Group IV

Township High School District 214 - Mt. Prospect
General Telephone Co. of Kentucky - Lexington, Kentucky
Jewel Food Store - Palatine
Rudich/Pappageorge - Chicago
Gustay Braum Architect - Northfield
Sears - Golf Mill
Plum Grove Farm
U.S. Gypsum, Research - Des Plaines
P D S Construction - Arlington Heights
Cozell Carpentry - Buffalo Grove
Fleetwater Cafe - Chicago
Skidmore Owens & Merrill - Chicago
Marcress Engineering - Schaumburg
Jewel - Rolling Meadows
Centex Homes - St. Charles
Phillips Manu. Co. - 8200 Grand Ave. S - Bloominton, Minn.
State of Illinois
Philip A. Fard - 1013 E. 162nd. St.

Group V

Self employed
John C. King - 907 W. Fairchild - Danville
Lakewoods Industries Inc. - Schaumburg
Jewel Food Stores - Elgin
Jans Steel Co. - Elk Grove
Sears - Woodfield
Jewel Food Stores - Arlington Heights
R M S Instrument Manu. - Deerfield
North American Heating & Air Conditioning - Hoffman Estates
Poly Shapes Inc. 140 E. End Dr. - Gilberts, Il.
Lisec & Klinek - Chicago
Harland & Barthaloev - Northbrook
Shell Oil Co. - Baseline & Mill - Tempe, Arizona
City of Tucson Planning Dept. - Tucson, Arizona

Descriptions of Jobs Unrelated to Architecture

Group II

Lost interest - 8
Plant Engineering, Conveyors, Control Room
Decided psychology appealed to me more.
Change in interest - will receive B.F.A. in photography
No opportunities opening for the job
Got married

Group III

Couldn't get a job in Architectural field - 3
My interests changed towards electronics.
I am between schools attempting to decide on an occupation.
I presently work as an electronic technician.
Got married and was drafted.
Used his courses for his Fine Arts degree.
Interests changed.

Group IV

Decided to teach Power Mechanics.
Change of interest - discovered realities of field.
Working at Jewel for 8 yrs. and cannot afford to take a pay cut now.
Was told I didn't have enough experience.
Works as a carpenter.
Enjoyed art and designing.

Group V

Had to work for a year so she could afford school.
Works summers full time as a steel fabricator.
Can't find part-time work at drafting.
Had job when started school - very well Paying.
Sale proprietor at R M S Instrument Manu. Co.
Salary is not enough.
Full time student.
Will be in the field in May.
Working in accounts payable.
I'm a pipe fitter.
Job I have works out with my school.

Courses which, if included in the curriculum, would have benefited students

Group I

More Drawing and Drafting courses.
More Building Products courses.
Design courses and Art.

Group II

Much more Business Writing and English.
Electrical Engineering and Estimating.
Engineering courses.
Another computer course.
Estimating courses.

Group III

Landscape Architecture - 2
Basic Design - 2
Everything he took - 2
Anything related to project development.
More stress on Drafting techniques.
Courses related to physical site planning.
More refinement of basic graphic skills, much more Math, Architectural procedures in real business situations.
Need sales courses.
Speech or Math courses.

Group IV

Everything I learn is of benefit to me.
Lettering.
Art courses related to Architecture.
More courses in graphic presentation and techniques.
ARC drawing courses.
Excellent program.
Math
Changed my major
More computer courses.
Rendering courses.
Construction estimating and contract survellance.
Graphic design courses.

Group V

All ATE series - 2
Drafting
Emphasis on idea presentation and desentation techniques.
Calculus II
Construction, estimating cost of construction and some legal courses.
I think we should follow the transfer program provided by Univ. of Illinois.
ARC 101,102, Physics 121, 122, Calculus Arch. History courses.
Principles of office practice.
Took 2 full yrs. - everything benefited me.
More Math and Physics Statics.
More Urban Planning and Designing.

42

Strengths of Harper's Architecture Transfer Program

Group I

More time should be spent on each area.
More courses available to determine if architecture is what you really want to do.
Good experience of what students were getting into.
Freedom in architecture computer classes.

Group II

Building construction and computer work.
The faculty helped me to recognize and value the interests which led me away from architecture.
Good program.
Basically everything.
That it had a computer tech course.
Teachers

Group III

The instructors and their basic approach to teaching. - 2
Classes were good. - 2
The instructors were interested - program addressed real needs.
Multitude of courses it offers.
History courses and basic design courses.
The beginning courses that were transferable.
All the courses.
Counseling and History courses were good.
History
Design courses
Smaller classes.

Group IV

Teachers were excellent - 4
Northern Ill. Univ. accepted most credits.
Utilization of computer applications in Architecture.
Prepared ARC students for what was to come.
G. Lehmann
Fits in with U I C C curriculum - no problems with transferring the courses.
First year design class and equipment.
The ability to cover many aspects of architecture field.
Solid stepping stone as a personal background builder.
The program over all was good.
One counselor was very helpful.
Mr. Collins and Mr. Yohannan.
Class size and teachers.
Instructor involvement.

Strengths of Harper's Architecture Transfer Program (cont.)

Group V

Design classes - 6
Inexpensive
All classes
Computer courses and Analitical Mechanics.
Good way to teach, but a little weak - also your dept. didn't think about skills of drawing or making model.
Basic design covering things as shops, spaces, lines, and color.
First year prepares you in the basic design problems and color problems- second year the construction.
Not as overwhelming as Circle Campus - liked the atmosphere at Harper.
Learned more at Circle.
They tried to promote student's interests.
Very thorough - Arc History was very good.
Mr. Gunther was very thorough.
Mr. Guntherlehman and Mr. Yohanan
Some of the theory
The professors.
Computer graphics.
Covered a broad range of subjects.
History courses were good.
Harper already has name in Architecture - teachers are known at many good schools.

Other Suggestions for Improving Harper's Transfer Program

Group I

Wishes program was a 4 yr. plan.
Technical courses dealing with environmental control system and structural systems.
Harper was slower than 4 yr. college.
Work with colleges to find out what courses can be transferred.
Did not like teacher.
On the job training.
Instructors were poor - no teaching experience.

Group II

Better contact with other colleges - knowing what will and won't transfer. - 3
Business and Business English courses.
Strict deadlines (no tolerances)
Get students involved in non-classroom activities.
Discontinue - too few jobs.
Getting into more practical applications-We did things with perspective.
More Math and strengths of materials.

Group III

The advisors (counseling dept.) could be of greater help letting a student know exactly what he needs to fulfill his goals and be honest about what Harper could provide for him.
I thought that the program was excellent.
Evacuate individual student's progress on a basic independent of GPA.
Make sure the courses were transferable.
A little more machine work in the first semester.
Design courses were not geared for outside work - more for classroom.
Explain more thoroughly the design course.

Group IV

Educate the students as to what colleges accept credits. - 2
Harper should develop a comprehensive course designed to familiarize the students with the realities of the job market. Poor salary.
Get more people interested and try to bring out their creative nature.
Getting U I C C to accept the second year design program.
I should have taken ARC 205, ARC 206, ARC 203 and ARC 204 - Univ. of Ill. has its own feeling on Design.
Do away with ATE 105 or switch to a Fortran course that will transfer.
Not enough students attending so courses were always cancelled.
Work with other state schools to fit their program to meet theirs so the credits will transfer.
Transfer more technical that you use in the drawings.
Get into designing houses in Basic 101.
Classes were too long.
Pretty good program.
Design program.
More Graphic Design courses.
More communication with the other schools.

Other Suggestions for Improving Harper's Transfer Program (cont.)

Group V

Improvement of transferable courses - 3
Include some of the ATE clesses.
Better advising from counselors, I have very few kind words for Ed Uska who advised me while at Harper.
Many - Please have Mr. Lehmann call me - Dan Jenkins 397-9200.
Offer strength of materials for architects and possibly truss analysis.
Would appreciate more discussion of students work with teacher - comments are helpful.
Do not transfer students to I I T who don't have a strong background in drafting - students will be unprepared.
None - very sucessfully transferred after 1 yr.
Require more of the suggested reading material.
Improvement of transferrable credits to Univ. of Ill. (Urbana).
Drop basic design and add more construction principles to Design I & II.
Skill of drawing - discuss more plans and sections of a building with the student.
ARC 201 & 202 should be more credit hours.
More practical work.
Needs to be rearranged - too long and dragged out.
Math and Physics are fine - Design courses were not intense - the aspect of drawing wasn't developed enough.
Should be more in the first year program.
The facilities were quite good - lighting very good - much better than Circle.
Students should know more about program as freshman.
More drafting classes.
More practical design courses.
The instructors of Design I & II Arch. History should be changed.
Make it a 5 yr. program.

APPENDIX

FOLLOW-UP SURVEY OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE TAKEN
THE ARCHITECTURAL TRANSFER PROGRAM AT HARPER COLLEGE

Name _____

Address _____

City and State _____ Zip Code _____

Telephone _____

Please place a (✓) beside those items which are applicable and provide the appropriate remark where indicated. Your responses will be appreciated.

1. Which program did you follow while at Harper? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Transfer Architectural Design Program
_____ B. Occupational Architectural Technology Associate Degree Program
_____ C. Occupational Architectural Technology Certificate Program
_____ D. Took Architectural Design or Architectural Technology courses for general interest only.
_____ E. Other goal (specify)_____

2. Since taking courses at Harper, what education levels have you achieved at other colleges? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. I have not taken any courses at another college. If you answere here, skip to question 6.
_____ B. I have taken less than 36 hours at another college.
_____ C. I have taken less than 54 hours at another college.
_____ D. I have taken more than 54 hours at another college.
_____ E. I have achieved a bachelors degree.
Specify degree: _____
Specify college: _____
_____ F. I have achieved a masters degree.
Specify degree: _____
Specify college: _____
_____ G. Other achievements: _____
_____

3. If you are attending (or have attended) another college since leaving Harper, what is (was) your major area of study there?

_____
Which college? _____

4. If you are attending (have attended) another college since leaving Harper, what is your approximate cumulative grade point average on a 4.0 basis? Check (✓) the closest GPA.

"A" 4.0 _____ 3.8 ____ 3.6 ____ 3.4 ____ 3.2 ____
"B" 3.0 _____ 2.8 ____ 2.6 ____ 2.4 ____ 2.2 ____
"C" 2.0 _____ 1.8 ____ 1.6 ____ 1.4 ____ 1.2 ____
"D" 1.0 _____

5. If you have attended another college since leaving Harper, what course were you able to transfer? Check the appropriate column for each course.

	Transferred course successfully	I tried but was unable to transfer course	I didn't try to transfer courses	Didn't take course
ARC 101 Basic Design I				
ARC 102 Basic Design I				
ARC 201 Design I				
ARC 202 Design I				
ARC 205 Arch. History I				
ARC 206 Arch. History II				
ATE 105 Computer Math for Arch. Tech.				
MTH 105 Analytic Geometry				
MTH 201 Calculus I				
PHY 121 Introd. Physics I				
PHY 122 Introd. Physics II				
EGR 150 Analytical Mechanics				
ART 110 Drawing I				
ART 110 Drawing II				

Specify college which transferred or did not transfer credits:

_____

6. What is your present employment situation? Check (✓) one.

_____ A. Employed in an architectural office.
_____ B. Employed in a field related to architecture.
_____ C. Employed in a field unrelated to architecture.
_____ D. Unemployed but seeking employment.
_____ E. Unemployed and not seeking employment.
_____ F. Other

If you are employed, name of employer _____
Address _____

7. If you work as an architect, for an architect, or in a field related to architecture, check (✓) your primary responsibilities and/or your position.

	In an architectural office	In a engineering office	For a municipality or governmental body	For a corporation
Drafting				
Designing				
Specification writing				
Estimating				
Computer applications				
Surveying				
Contracting				
Carpentry				
Masonry work				
Manufacturing of Building Products				
Purchasing of Building Products				
Electrical work				
HVAC work				
Interior design				
Building Inspection				
Other				
_____				
_____				

8. If you are working in a field completely unrelated to architecture, would you briefly explain (i.e., change in interest, employment situations, etc.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. In what geographic area do you work?

_____ A. Downtown Chicago
_____ B. Metropolitan area of Chicago
_____ C. State of Illinois
_____ D. Out-of-state

10. Rate the courses that you have taken at Harper as to their benefit to you, on the job, in college or in the community. Check appropriate column for each course.

	Course proved very beneficial to me	Course was of some benefit to me	Course proved to be of little value to me	Didn't take course
ARC 101 Basic Design I				
ARC 102 Basic Design II				
ARC 201 Design I				
ARC 202 Design II				
ARC 205 Arch. History I				
ARC 206 Arch. History II				
ARC 203 Building Const. I				
ARC 204 Building Const. II				
ATE 101 Intro. to Arch. Technology I				
ATE 102 Intro. to Arch. Technology II				
ATE 103 Building Materials Technology I				
ATE 104 Building Materials Technology II				
ATE 105 Computer Math for Arch. Technology I				
ATE 106 Computer Math for Arch. Technology II				
ATE 201 Comprehensive Building Project I				
ATE 202 Comprehensive Building Project II				
ATE 203 Construction Problems I				
ATE 204 Construction Problems II				
ATE 205 Computer Graphics and Optimization				
ATE 206 Computer Applications in Arch.				
ATE 207 Behavior of Arch. Materials I				
ATE 208 Behavior of Arch. Materials II				
ATE 209 Building Const. Principles for Real Est.				
Solar Energy Architecture Seminars				
MTH 105 Analytic Geometry				
MTH 201 Calculus I				
PHY 121 Introd. Physics I				
PHY 122 Introd. Physics II				
EGR 150 Analytical Mechanics				
ART 110 Drawing I				
ART 111 Drawing II				
Other:				

11. Are there courses or skills which, had they been included in your curriculum, would have benefited you on your job, in college, or in your community?

12. List what you feel were the strengths of Harper's Architectural Transfer program?

13. Do you have any suggestions for ways in which Harper could improve its Architectural Transfer program?

THANK YOU.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JUN 18 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES